

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 are allowed. The Examiner now applies a new reference, Suga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,800,376), to support the rejections of the remaining claims. Specifically, claims 1-9, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Suga.

Applicant traverses these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

A brief description of Suga is as follows.

Suga is directed to a multiple display system adapted to display data in the VIDEOTEX standard on a display formed of a plurality of display devices. The system comprises an encoder for generating a code on the basis of internal or external data supplied thereto, a plurality of decoders, each of which includes a central processing unit, successively arranged in series with respect to the encoder, and a plurality of display devices provided respectively corresponding to the plurality of decoders to thereby display a large image by the plurality of display devices. The encoder inserts an identification number in a predetermined portion of a data sequence. The plurality of decoders respectively select data with corresponding identification number, convert the selected data into a video signal, and supply respective display devices with the video signal.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Suga does not disclose or suggest at least, "each image displayer comprising:... a scaler for selecting a video signal corresponding to a predetermined area of the display based on an externally transmitted control signal, and enlarging the selected video signal according to a size of the display," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner alleges that the decoders 3a through 3i correspond to the claimed scaler that constitutes each image displayer, as recited in claim 1. However, nowhere in Suga is it taught or suggested that each of the display devices 4a-4i comprises respective decoders 3a-3i.

In the multiple display system of Suga, the decoders of the display devices are separate and do not constitute the display devices, respectively. Therefore, at least because the above-discussed feature is not satisfied by Suga, Applicant submits that Suga does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicant submits that independent claims 8 and 15 are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-7, 9, and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 8.

Further, with respect to claim 9, nowhere does the Examiner mention nor does Suga teach or suggest at least, “wherein the video signal selecting unit comprises: a first selecting unit for selecting a predetermined area of the video signal added to a horizontal sync signal of the video signal; and a second selecting unit for selecting a predetermined area of the video signal added to a vertical sync signal of the video signal,” as recited in claim 9.

Yet further, Applicant submits that Suga discloses a structure in which a decoder is separated from a display device, whereas the claimed invention discloses a structure in which a display, which can show a video, and a scaler, which can cause a video to be displayed on the display in an enlarged form, are integrated into a single video display device (image displayer). By this structure, the claimed invention can resolve exemplary problems preventing the construction of a wide screen when the number of video display devices 21 to 24 do not match that of the output ports formed on the video signal separator 10. That is, Suga requires the same number of decoders and display devices.

Suga discloses a structure in which data and control lines are in series connected with the decoders in a wide screen construction, whereas the claimed invention may not result in these lines be connected with the decoder in series. The claimed invention can result in the omission

of the use of the video signal separator 10 shown in FIG. 1, because the scaler and the frame buffer can perform the job of the video signal separator 10. Furthermore, the claimed invention can result in the same video signal entering the respective sets 21 to 24.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: November 13, 2007